

# EXHIBIT G

**From:** [Patrick McGill](#)  
**To:** [kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com](mailto:kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com)  
**Cc:** [foster.brett@dorsey.com](mailto:foster.brett@dorsey.com); [MBader@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:MBader@sheppardmullin.com); [JSalen@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:JSalen@sheppardmullin.com);  
[NThomas@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:NThomas@parsonsbehle.com); [LButler@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:LButler@parsonsbehle.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Blendtec v. BlendJet - New Practice Affiliation  
**Date:** Wednesday, February 8, 2023 9:17:00 AM

---

Brett and Tammy,

Thank you for your time yesterday afternoon on our conference call. A summary of the results of our discussion on the topics raised by BlendJet follows below, in red.

With thanks,  
Patrick

**From:** Patrick McGill  
**Sent:** Monday, February 6, 2023 5:11 PM  
**To:** [kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com](mailto:kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com)  
**Cc:** [foster.brett@dorsey.com](mailto:foster.brett@dorsey.com); [MBader@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:MBader@sheppardmullin.com); [JSalen@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:JSalen@sheppardmullin.com);  
[NThomas@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:NThomas@parsonsbehle.com); [LButler@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:LButler@parsonsbehle.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Blendtec v. BlendJet - New Practice Affiliation

Tammy,

Please be prepared to discuss the following matters tomorrow during our call:

In your capacity as representative of MarketStar, vis-à-vis BlendJet's subpoena: Whether Marketstar is refusing to produce any documentation in response to the BlendJet subpoena (apart from Blendtec's agreement to produce emails from Mr. Titus's and Mr. Kaufman's MarketStar email accounts that contain search terms provided to Blendtec for those custodians). **You confirmed that MarketStar is "standing on its objections," and will not produce any documentation in response to the subpoena.**

In your capacity as representative of Blendtec:

1. Whether Blendtec will be dropping its Seventh Cause of Action (Utah state law dilution claim), in addition to its federal trademark dilution claim. **You confirmed that Blendtec is dropping its Seventh Cause of Action.**
2. Whether Blendtec is withholding the names of any individuals with knowledge of "the circumstances surrounding the decision . . . to apply to register the Blendtec Mark" in response to BlendJet Interrogatory No. 2, on the basis that those individuals "are no longer with Blendtec," or under some other theory. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]
3. Whether Blendtec is withholding any non-custodial documentation responsive to BlendJet RFP Nos. 8 and 15 [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. Whether Blendtec is withholding any non-custodial documentation responsive to BlendJet RFP Nos. 17 and 19 (e.g., responsive materials other than the documents identified in Blendtec's Consolidated Responses to BlendJet's First Set of Discovery Requests (at pages 64-65, and 67-68)). You confirmed that Blendtec is not withholding any such documentation, and that the documents that Blendtec has produced in response to these requests to date (and identified as such) are "sufficient to identify any particular classes of U.S. consumers targeted by Blendtec's advertising." (See Blendtec Consolidated Responses to First Set of Discovery at 64-65 and 68.)
5. Whether Blendtec is withholding any non-custodial documentation responsive to BlendJet RFP No. 36 (e.g., responsive materials other than the agreements identified in Blendtec's Consolidated Responses to BlendJet's First Set of Discovery Requests (at pages 87-88)), and whether Blendtec is refusing to supplement its response to BlendJet Interrogatory No. 13 (at pages 37-40 of Blendtec's Consolidated Responses to BlendJet's First Set of Discovery Requests) to present a detailed narrative description of the relationships between Blendtec and Blendid/Blendfresh. You stated that Blendtec is not aware of any agreements that would be responsive to Request No. 36 other than those that it has already produced, and that Blendtec will not produce any other non-custodial documentation in its possession that is responsive to RFP No. 36. Additionally, you confirmed that Blendtec will not supplement its response to Interrogatory No. 13.

Additionally, please provide a verification of Blendtec's Consolidated Responses to BlendJet's First Set of Discovery Requests, as is required under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33. We reiterate our request for Blendtec to provide this verification.

Sincerely,  
Patrick

---

**From:** [kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com](mailto:kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com) <[kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com](mailto:kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, February 3, 2023 8:55 AM

**To:** Patrick McGill <[patrick@mcgillco.com](mailto:patrick@mcgillco.com)>

**Cc:** [foster.brett@dorsey.com](mailto:foster.brett@dorsey.com); [MBader@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:MBader@sheppardmullin.com); [JSalen@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:JSalen@sheppardmullin.com); [NThomas@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:NThomas@parsonsbehle.com); [LButler@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:LButler@parsonsbehle.com)

**Subject:** FW: Blendtec v. BlendJet - New Practice Affiliation

Hi Patrick,

Thanks for your message. Sounds like you have a lot of balls in the air. Let's plan to meet and confer on Tuesday, Feb. 7 at 1:00 pm MST on the issues in the attached email. Please let us know if that works for you.

Also, we need to know what matters you wish to confer about so that we will be prepared to discuss during our call. Otherwise, the call is not likely to be very productive. Please let us know in advance of the call what you would like to discuss.

Thanks,  
Tammy

---

**From:** Patrick McGill <[patrick@mcgillco.com](mailto:patrick@mcgillco.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 1, 2023 4:20 PM  
**To:** Foster, Brett <[foster.brett@dorsey.com](mailto:foster.brett@dorsey.com)>; Kapaloski, Tammy <[kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com](mailto:kapaloski.tammy@dorsey.com)>  
**Cc:** Martin Bader <[MBader@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:MBader@sheppardmullin.com)>; Jesse Salen <[JSalen@sheppardmullin.com](mailto:JSalen@sheppardmullin.com)>;  
[nthomas@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:nthomas@parsonsbehle.com); Liz Butler <[lbutler@parsonsbehle.com](mailto:lbutler@parsonsbehle.com)>  
**Subject:** Blendtec v. BlendJet - New Practice Affiliation

**EXTERNAL FROM OUTSIDE DORSEY. BE CAUTIOUS OF LINKS AND ATTACHMENTS.**

Dear Brett and Tammy,

As of today, I have transitioned my practice to a new entity (McGill & Co.). Otherwise, the counsel representing BlendJet in the Blendtec matter will not be changing. You can send future email correspondence directed to me related to the Blendtec matter to this email address.

With respect to your request to meet and confer this week: As you might imagine, there are a few balls in the air this week related to the creation of my new practice. If you are available on this Friday, please let us know when, and we will check our schedules. There are a number of matters that we also wish to confer with you about, including MarketStar's present response to the outstanding subpoena and several of Blendtec's positions related to discovery that has been requested from it.

Sincerely,  
Patrick

**Patrick McGill** | Attorney  
Tel: (619) 974-8886  
[pmcgill@mcgillco.com](mailto:pmcgill@mcgillco.com)

-----  
**MCGILL & CO.**

Attention: This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.